MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Held in Washington, D.C., November 20,1946.

The third meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, during the fiscal year 1947, was held in its office in the Interior Department Building on Wednesday, November 20, 1946. The following members were present:

Mr. Finley, Vice Chairman,
Mr. Reinhard,
Mr. Sterne,
Mr. Murphy,
Mr. Lawrie,
also H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary and Administrative Officer.

Chairman Clarke was unavoidably prevented from being present, and therefore Mr. Finley served as Acting Chairman.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The Minutes of the Meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, held on October 4, 1946, were approved.

2. NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS Headquarters Building: Mr. Harvey Miller, Architect, resubmitted his design for the headquarters building of the National Association of Letter Carriers, to be built at First Street and Indiana Avenue, Northwest.

The drawing was inspected by Mr. Reinhard and Mr. Murphy, who observed that the architect had embodied suggestions made at the meeting of the Commission on October 4th. On their recommendation the Commission approved the design. It was regarded appropriate for the location adjacent to the Capitol Grounds. The building is to be faced with white marble. A report approving the design was sent to the National Association of Letter Carriers (Exhibit A).

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Held in Washington, D.C., November 20, 1946.

The third meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, during the fiscal year 1947, was held in its office in the Interior Department Building on Wednesday, November 20, 1946. The following members were present:

Mr. Finley, Vice Chairman,
Mr. Reinhard,
Mr. Sterne,
Mr. Murphy,
Mr. Lawrie,

also H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary and Administrative Officer.

Chairman Clarke was unavoidably prevented from being present, and therefore Mr. Finley served as Acting Chairman.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OR MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The Minutes of the Meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, held on October 4, 1946, were approved.

2. MATTERS ARISING OUT OF LETTER CARRIERS Headquarters Building: Mr. Harvey Miller, Architect, resubmitted his design for the headquarters building of the National Association of Letter Carriers, to be built at First Street and Indiana Avenue, Northwest.

The drawing was inspected by Mr. Reinhard and Mr. Murphy, who observed that the architect had embodied suggestions made at the meeting of the Commission on October 4th. On their recommendation the Commission approved the design. It was regarded appropriate for the location adjacent to the Capitol Grounds. The building is to be faced with white marble. A report approving the design was sent to the National Association of Letter Carriers (Exhibit A).

3. WAR MEMORIAL BOOKLET: The Secretary presented a page proof, in the form of a "dummy" for the proposed publication on War Memorials, to consist of sixteen pages, with 16 to 18 illustrations.

The Commission inspected the copy and in general thought it to be complete and satisfactory. The suggestion to indicate the pages of the pictures in the list of illustrations was agreed to.

Mr. Finley was very desirous of having a picture of a monument showing a large panel for names of soldiers to be commemorated. He mentioned the Leesburg (Virginia) World War I Memorial, but the Commission did not favor this since it has a bronze tablet, showing names, on marble.

Mr. Lawrie said he felt he could locate a photograph of a monument that would be suitable from among his collection of pictures. It is proposed to have the publication available early in the year 1947.

4. SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT SUBMISSIONS:

(a) The Secretary submitted a drawing received from the Inspector of Buildings (Application No.1109, dated November 13, 1946) for a commercial building at 21st Street and Virginia Avenue, Northwest.

Mr. Reinhard and Mr. Murphy inspected the design and disapproved it. They regarded it a cheap commercial building. No plans were submitted.

The Secretary stated that the location is in the "Northwest Rectangle", where the Government is acquiring land for public buildings.

On the recommendation of Mr. Reinhard and Mr. Murphy, the Commission disapproved the design and recommended that the applicant be requested to submit an improved design, with perspective and plans; also that the question of possible Government purchase of the location should be brought to his attention. A report was sent to the Director of Inspection accordingly (Exhibit B).

3. WAR MEMORIAL BOOKLET: The Secretary presented a page proof, in the form of a "dummy" for the proposed publication on War Memorials, to consist of sixteen pages, with 16 to 18 illustrations.

The Commission inspected the copy and in general thought it to be complete and satisfactory. The suggestion to indicate the pages of the pictures in the list of illustrations was agreed to.

Mr. Finley was very desirous of having a picture of a monument showing a large panel for names of soldiers to be commemorated. He mentioned the Leesburg (Virginia) World War I Memorial, but the Commission did not favor this since it has a bronze tablet, showing names, on marble.

Mr. Lawrie said he felt he could locate a photograph of a monument that would be suitable from among his collection of pictures. It is proposed to have the publication available early in the year 1947.

4. UNFINISHED-BUSINESS AGT SUBMISSIONS:

(a) The Secretary submitted a drawing received from the Inspector of Buildings (Application No.1109, dated November 13, 1946) for a commercial building at 21st Street and Virginia Avenue, Northwest.

Mr. Reinhard and Mr. Murphy inspected the design and disapproved it. They regarded it a cheap commercial building. No plans were submitted.

The Secretary stated that this location is in the "Northwest Redevelopment" where the Government is acquiring land for public buildings.

On the recommendation of Mr. Reinhard and Mr. Murphy, the Commission disapproved the design and recommended that the applicant be requested to submit an improved design, with perspective and plans; also that the question of possible Government purchase of the location should be brought to his attention. A report was sent to the Director of Inspection accordingly (Exhibit B).

(b) The Secretary submitted a drawing received from the Inspector of Buildings (Application No.1110, dated November 13, 1946) for an apartment building at 25th and E Streets, Northwest.

Mr. Reinhard and Mr. Murphy inspected the design and disapproved it. They thought it suggested a cheap apartment building. No plans were submitted.

The Secretary called attention to the fact that the location proposed for the apartment is within the taking line of the site selected for a Navy Department Building, and that the Commissioner of Public Buildings has funds from Congress to acquire the land desired for the building in that locality.

On the recommendation of Mr. Reinard and Mr. Murphy, the Commission disapproved the design and recommended that the applicant be requested to submit an improved design, with perspective and plans; also that his attention be called to the fact that the Government has authority from Congress to buy the site in question as part of the grounds needed for a Department Building. A report was sent to the Director of Inspection accordingly (Exhibit C).

5. SOUSA JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL: Mr. Merrel A. Coe, Municipal Architect, submitted a revised design for the Sousa Junior High School, to be built at Ely Place between 36th and 37th Streets, Southeast.

Mr. Reinhard and Mr. Murphy inspected the design and noted that Mr. Coe had embodied suggestions made at the meeting of the Commission on October 4th, particularly with reference to rearrangement of windows or omission of some of them to give more solid wall space. Mr. Coe pointed out a change in a stair tower that materially improved the plan for the interior.

On the recommendation of Mr. Reinhard and Mr. Murphy, the Commission approved the design (Exhibit D).

6. RECEIVING HOME FOR CHILDREN: Mr. Merrel A. Coe, Municipal Architect,

(b) The Secretary submitted a drawing received from the Inspector of Buildings (Application No.1110, dated November 13, 1946) for an apartment building at 25th and K Streets, Northwest.

Mr. Reinhard and Mr. Murphy inspected the design and disapproved it. They thought it suggested a cheap apartment building. No plans were submitted.

The Secretary called attention to the fact that the location proposed for the apartment is within the taking line of the site selected for a Navy Department Building, and that the Commissioner of Public Buildings has funds from Congress to acquire the land desired for the building in that locality.

On the recommendation of Mr. Reinhard and Mr. Murphy, the Commission disapproved the design and recommended that the applicant be requested to submit an improved design, with perspective and plans; also that his attention be called to the fact that the Government has authority from Congress to buy the site in question as part of the grounds needed for a Department Building. A report was sent to the Director of Inspection accordingly (Exhibit C).

B. SOUSA JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL: Mr. Merrel A. Coe, Municipal Architect, submitted a revised design for the Sousa Junior High School, to be built at Hay Place between 34th and 37th Streets, Southeast.

Mr. Reinhard and Mr. Murphy inspected the design and noted that Mr. Coe had embodied suggestions made at the meeting of the Commission on October 4th, particularly with reference to rearrangement of windows or omission of some of them to give more solid wall space. Mr. Coe pointed out a change in a stair tower that materially improved the plan for the interior.

On the recommendation of Mr. Reinhard and Mr. Murphy, the Commission approved the design (Exhibit D).

C. MONUMENTAL HOME FOR CHILDREN: Mr. Merrel A. Coe, Municipal Architect,

submitted a revised design for the Receiving Home for Children, to be built on the north side of Mt. Olivet Road west of Corcoran Street, Northeast.

Mr. Reinhard and Mr. Murphy inspected the design, and on their recommendation the Commission approved it (Exhibit D).

7. MODELS FOR WORLD WAR II OCCUPATION MEDAL: The Commission received models for a World War II Occupation Medal, from the Office of the Quartermaster General, War Department, with letter as follows:

19 November, 1946.

The Commission of Fine Arts,
Washington, D.C.,
Gentlemen:

There are transmitted herewith designs for the reverse and obverse of the Army of Occupation medal, as designed by Mr. Thomas Hudson Jones, Heraldic Section, of this office, and which have been personally approved by the Chief of Staff, General Eisenhower. This medal is to be suspended from a service ribbon, sample inclosed, and it includes symbols, representing Germany by the Remagen Bridge and Japan by the Japanese junks in front of Fujiyama, the Remagen Bridge to be used as the obverse of the medal.

Inasmuch as it is desired to expedite the production of this medal and to make supply to the troops now, it is requested that concurrence of these designs be granted by the Commission of Fine Arts at its next stated meeting, 20 November, 1946.

This office appreciates your cooperation in the past and hopes that it will be favored with your concurrence.

Sincerely yours,
T. B. LARKIN,
Major General
The Quartermaster General.

The models were brought to the particular attention of Mr. Lawrie, who criticized them severely and disapproved them. The Commission concurred. The Remagen Bridge showing also towers was thought satisfactory for the obverse if redesigned. The reverse required complete modification. The model of the "junk" was bad as also Fujiyama; also the lettering required restudy. It was thought a warship might be preferable to a Japanese junk.

The Commission decided that Mr. Lawrie and Mr. Sterne should call at the office of the Quartermaster General during the afternoon, and have a talk with Mr. Jones. This was done, and Mr. Lawrie reported as follows:

submitted a revised design for the Receiving Home for Children, to be built on the north side of Mt. Olivet Road west of Croceton Street, Northeast. Mr. Reinhard and Mr. Murphy inspected the design, and on their recommendation the Commission approved it (Exhibit D).

7. MODELS FOR WORLD WAR II OCCUPATION MEDAL: The Commission received models for a World War II Occupation Medal, from the Office of the Quartermaster General, War Department, with letter as follows:

19 November, 1946.

The Commission of Fine Arts,
Washington, D.C.

Gentlemen:

There are transmitted herewith designs for the reverse and obverse of the Army of Occupation medal, as designed by Mr. Thomas Hudson Jones, Heraldic Section, of this office, and which have been personally approved by the Chief of Staff, General Eisenhower. This medal is to be suspended from a service ribbon, sample inclosed, and it includes symbols, representing Germany by the Remagen Bridge and Japan by the Japanese junks in front of Fujiyama, the Remagen Bridge to be used as the obverse of the medal.

Inasmuch as it is desired to expedite the production of this medal and to make supply to the troops now, it is requested that concurrence of these designs be granted by the Commission of Fine Arts at its next stated meeting, 20 November, 1946.

This office appreciates your cooperation in the past and hopes that it will be favored with your concurrence.

Sincerely yours,

T. B. LEMMON,
Major General
The Quartermaster General.

The models were brought to the particular attention of Mr. Lawrie, who criticized them severely and disapproved them. The Commission concurred. The Remagen Bridge showing also towers was thought satisfactory for the obverse if redesigned. The reverse required complete modification. The model of the "junk" was good as also Fujiyama; also the lettering required restudy. It was thought a warship might be preferable to a Japanese junk.

The Commission decided that Mr. Lawrie and Mr. Sterne should call at the office of the Quartermaster General during the afternoon, and have a talk with Mr. Jones. This was done, and Mr. Lawrie reported as follows:

Easton, Md., Nov.21.

Dear Mr. Caemmerer:

Mr. Sterne and I explained to Mr. Dubois and Mr. Jones what we thought would improve the design for the Army Occupation Medal.

Jones was quite in accord with the suggestions and will revise the two sides and submit the models or photographs of them when he gets it done.

I told them the date for the next meeting isn't set but that we would arrange to consider the models almost as soon as the models come in.

Best regards,

Lee Lawrie.

8. STATUE OF NATHAN HALE: Major Frank Fox, representing the Executors, submitted a revised design for the pedestal of the statue of Nathan Hale, which he received from the architect, Douglas Orr, with letter:

New Haven, Conn., Nov.1, 1946.

Mr. Frank Fox,
1630 R Street, N.W.,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Fox:

In response to your letter of October 11, sending me the criticisms of the Commission of Fine Arts, we have redrawn the design for the pedestal and are sending you herewith a black and white print.

I think this conforms to all the requests of the Commission, except that the suggestion of the incised lettering on the base has not been shown. Inasmuch as the drum on which the figure stands has the last words of Nathan Hale inscribed around this drum, it seemed to me that it would be superfluous to add it again on the base. Therefore, we have simply indicated the inscription of the name of Nathan Hale and the dates.

I feel that the drawing being sent is probably sufficient for the Commission's purpose, but if it would like to have further drawings please advise us.

Yours very truly,

Douglas Orr,

Architect.

The Commission considered the design and thought it better than the former one submitted by Mr. Orr. The Commission agreed with him that since the last words of Nathan Hale are on the drum of the statue they should not be repeated on the pedestal. However, the Commission felt that simply the name Nathan Hale and dates of his birth and death are not sufficient in the way of inscription for the pedestal. Therefore, the Commission suggested a

Boston, Mass., Nov. 23.

Dear Mr. Cammerer:

Mr. Sterne and I explained to Mr. Dubois and Mr. Jones what we thought would improve the design for the Army Occupation Medal.

Jones was quite in accord with the suggestions and will revise the two sides and submit the models or photographs of them when he gets it done.

I told them the date for the next meeting isn't set but that we would arrange to consider the models almost as soon as the models come in.

Best regards,

Lee Lamrie.

8. STATUE OF NATHAN HALE: Major Frank Cox, representing the Executors, submitted a revised design for the pedestal of the statue of Nathan Hale, which he received from the architect, Douglas Orr, with letter:

New Haven, Conn., Nov.7, 1925.

Mr. Frank Cox,
1830 R Street, N.W.,
Washington, D.C.
Dear Mr. Cox:

In response to your letter of October 17, sending me the criticisms of the Commission of Fine Arts, we have redrawn the design for the pedestal and are sending you herewith a black and white print.

I think this conforms to all the requests of the Commission, except that the suggestion of the incised lettering on the base has not been shown. Inasmuch as the drum on which the figure stands has the last words of Nathan Hale inscribed around this drum, it seemed to me that it would be superfluous to add it again on the base. Therefore, we have simply indicated the inscription of the name of Nathan Hale and the dates.

I feel that the drawing being sent is probably sufficient for the Commission's purpose, but if it would like to have further drawings please advise me.

Yours very truly,

Douglas Orr,

Architect.

The Commission considered the design and thought it better than the former one submitted by Mr. Orr. The Commission agreed with him that since the last words of Nathan Hale are on the drum of the statue they should not be repeated on the pedestal. However, the Commission felt that simply the name Nathan Hale and dates of his birth and death are not sufficient in the way of inscription for the pedestal. Therefore, the Commission suggested a

brief statement of his military record be shown on the pedestal, similar to that shown on the pedestal of the statue of Nathan Hale in City Hall Park,N.Y.

Mr. Reinhard indicated some further changes on the design submitted.These were agreed to by the Commission. A report was sent to Mr. Orr (Exhibit E).

9. APARTMENT 3900 Sixteenth Street, N.W.: Under date of October 9,1946, a set of plans was received for an Apartment at 3900 Sixteenth Street (Application No.1105). The plans were sent to Mr. Reinhard, who considered them with Chairman Clarke, and they were disapproved November 5, 1946.

Mr. Reinhard made the following criticisms and recommendations:

Redesign the balconies,
Submit sample of brick to be used, re color,
Question use of brick sills,
Type and material of stone wall (that is finish and color) and the treatment at corner of Parkway wall at Garage entrance. What material is to be used for copings.

In view of the location adjacent to the Piney Branch Parkway, the Secretary had brought the plans to the attention of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and a Memorandum was received from Mr. Nolen of that Commission criticizing in particular the treatment of the wall along the Piney Branch Parkway, and land for future Seventeenth Street development (Exhibit F).

All the above criticisms were brought to the attention of the architects, Messrs. Berla and Abel, through the Secretary, and arrangements were made for them for a conference with the Commission at 12:30 p.m. Both Mr.Berla and Mr.Abel were present at that time, and after discussion, Major General U.S.Grant III, Chairman of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, also being present, all of the above criticisms were agreed to, to the satisfaction of the Commission of Fine Arts and General Grant, excepting that a design for the railing panel was requested, in connection with the grading along the Parkway. It was agreed that when the architects submitted such a satisfactory design with a complete set of drawings they would be approved. (Same were submitted to Mr.Murphy and approved (Applica.No.1112) on December 3,1946).

10. SESQUICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION, 1950: The Secretary brought to the attention of the Commission the draft of a Bill that he had received from Major General U.S. Grant III, Chairman of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, for comment and suggestions, proposing the establishment of a Commission for the Sesquicentennial Celebration of the Establishment of the National Government in the District of Columbia, in 1950. The Bill (Exhibit G) is to be introduced in Congress early in the year 1947, subject to modifications that may be deemed desirable, and contemplates an appropriation of $50,000 for expenses.

In connection with the preparation of plans, General Grant said that Mr. Justement, architect of Washington, is proposing a national competition for what might be considered a new plan for the City of Washington. General Grant said that since the L'Enfant Plan of 1791 is a well-established historic plan and was enlarged by the McMillan Commission of 1901, he was not in favor of such a competition but rather wished to have published a comprehensive plan for the Future Washington, to include the metropolitan area, based on the established Plan for the City of Washington. The Commission agreed with General Grant in this matter. A copy of the discussion is attached hereto and made a part of these Minutes (Exhibit G-1).

11. SIGN 911 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.: The Secretary brought to the attention of the Commission an application for an advertising sign at 911 Pennsylvania Avenue, Northwest, desired by the Douglas Shoe Company.

The Secretary pointed out that the sign as drawn suggests three signs and that Chairman Clarke was opposed to it, since it exceeds the 25 square feet allowed by the Commission under the Shipstead-Luce Act. A picture of the building was inspected, and the panel for it was noted. In the circumstances the Commission agreed to the sign, provided the applicant reduces the lettering to 25 square feet; also no red tubing is to be used. The Inspector of Buildings was informed accordingly (Exhibit H).

13. VETERANS' HOSPITAL: The Commission were in conference with representatives of the Office of the Chief of Engineers (Col. D.C.White, Col. W.C.Hall and Mr. Jeffrey, architect), of the Veterans' Administration (Mr. J. J. Rockefeller, Director of Construction), as well as the architects' representatives, Mr. Kiff and Mr. Jaeger of York & Sawyer, Mr. Justement, Architect of Washington, and several assistants, concerning a design for the Veterans' Hospital proposed for the "Nevius Tract" in Arlington County, Virginia. Preliminary drawings, sketches and photographs were submitted. General Grant offered a sight model made by Mr. Partridge to give some idea how the hospital would look from the Capitol.

It was shown from a drawing that it is proposed to have the building face east, 420 feet long and 9 stories high, with a half-story added, making the total height 116 feet. There would be a wing on the back. The building is to accommodate 120 Beds on each floor, or a total of 750, with provision for operating rooms, etc.

During the discussion it was brought out that the building would not be objectionable as seen from the west side of the Washington Monument, nor from the west side of the Lincoln Memorial and the Water Gate. The building would not be seen at all from Constitution Avenue. Mr. Justement said the latter was due to the trees. Mr. Kiff stated that lights are turned off about 9:00 to 9:50 p.m., so there is no need of facing the building with windows to the north, which the Veterans Administration would prefer to avoid, considering the patients; also on the south side the patients would be looking towards the Cemetery.

The data submitted was considered by all present satisfactory as the basis for the preparation of plans for the building, and the Commission authorized the architects to proceed accordingly. A copy of the discussion is attached hereto and made a part of these Minutes (Exhibit I).

13. RESIDENCE, 1731 PORTAL DRIVE, N.W.: Under date of November 15, 1946, the Inspector of Buildings submitted a design for a residence at 1731 Portal Drive, Northwest, adjacent to Rock Creek Park, near the District of Columbia boundary line (Application No.1111).

Mr. Reinhard and Mr. Murphy inspected the design and disapproved it; as lacking insufficient study;-windows lack rhythm, scale, composition. The also lacking was Commission concurred and recommended restudy, and Mr. Reinhard and Mr. Murphy were authorized to approve a revised design to be submitted.

(Mr. Murphy approved the revised design December 6, 1946)

14. GENERAL PATTON MEMORIAL: The Secretary reported that recently Chairman Clarke was informed that a Committee representing the General Patton Memorial Commission of Massachusetts was coming to Washington to inspect monuments with a view to getting ideas for a memorial to General Patton in Massachusetts; and that in accordance with Chairman Clarke's request he accompanied the committee during an inspection trip a few days ago (Exhibit J).

15. BUSTS OF WASHINGTON AND JEFFERSON FOR THE WHITE HOUSE: Mr. Finley asked that the Commission inspect plaster models of "Houdon busts" of Washington and Jefferson, which Mr. Tolman, Acting Director of the Collection of Fine Arts, Smithsonian Institution, offered to lend to the White House. The Commission inspected them and were well satisfied with them.

16. PORTRAITS OF CHIEF JUSTICE STONE: In accordance with arrangements made, the Commission called on Hon. Thomas E. Waggaman, Marshal of the United States Supreme Court, to inspect four portraits of Chief Justice Stone. Portraits numbered one and four were painted twenty years ago by painter H.S.Hubbel; No.3 by Eben F. Comins, and No.2 by [illegible].Fox within the past six months. The paintings by Mr. Fox seemed to the Commission the best as it portrayed Chief Justice Stone in striking character as justice. Mrs. Stone, who was present, was well pleased with the selection made. The Commission adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Mr. Finley was host to the Commission at luncheon, and after luncheon showed the Commission the film on the City of Washington which he made for Secretary of the Treasury Mellon in 1929. The Commission were much pleased to see it and agreed a new film on Washington would be very appropriate for the Sesquicentennial Celebration in 1950, which would show the improvements in Washington since 1929.

Copy

The Commission of Fine Arts

Washington, D.C.

November 20, 1946.

Dear Sirs:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting today approved the design for the proposed National Association of Letters Carriers headquarters building, submitted in your behalf by Mr. Harvey Miller, Architect, and to be built at First Street and Indiana Avenue, Northwest. It is understood the building will be faced with white marble.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley,
Acting Chairman.

The National Association of Letter Carriers,

Ninth Street and Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C.

Exhibit A

Exhibit A

November 22, 1946.

Dear Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on November 20, 1946, considered the design you submitted (Application No. 1109, dated November 13, 1946) for a commerical building at 21st Street and Virginia Avenue, Northwest. The Commission disapproved the design. No plans were submitted. The drawings suggests a cheap commerical building.

The Commission recommend that the applicant be requested to submit an improved design, with perspective and plans.

In view of the fact that the location proposed for the building is in the area known as the "Northwestern Rectangle," it is suggested that the Commissioner of Public Buildings, Federal Works Agency, be consulted to acertain whether or not it is proposed to purchase Square 104 for Government Buildings.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Yours very truly,

David E. Finley,
Acting Chairman.

Director of Inspection,
District Building,
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit B

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on November 20, 1946, considered the design you submitted (Application No. 1109, dated November 13, 1946) for a commercial building at 21st Street and Virginia Avenue, Northwest. The Commission disapproved the design. No plans were submitted. The drawing suggested a cheap commercial building.

The Commission recommend that the applicant be requested to submit an improved design, with perspective and plans.

In view of the fact that the location proposed for the building is in the area known as the "Northwestern Rectangle," it is suggested that the Commissioner of Public Buildings, Federal Works Agency, be consulted to ascertain whether or not it is proposed to purchase Square 104 for Government Buildings.

By the Commission of Fine Arts:

Yours very truly,

David E. Finley,
Acting Chairman.

Director of Inspection,
District Building,
Washington, D.C.

November 21, 1946.

Dear Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on November 20, 1946, considered the design you submitted (Application No.1110, dated November 13, 1946) for an apartment building at 25th and E Streets, Northwest. The Commission disapproved the design. No plans were submitted. The drawings suggests a cheap apartment building.

The Commission recommend that the applicant be requested to submit an improved design, with perspective and plans.

At the same time, the Commission call attention to the fact that the location designated for this proposed building is within the taking line for a proposed Navy Department Building. The Public Buildings Administration Federal Works Agency, has authority from Congress to buy land for the building. The Commissioner of Public Buildings should be consulted before a permit is issued to erect the apartment.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Yours very truly,

David E. Finley,
Acting Chairman.

Director of Inspection.
District Building.
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit C

November 21, 1946.

Dear Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on November 20, 1946, considered the design you submitted (pencil drawing dated November 11, [illegible]) for an apartment building at 25th and S Streets, Northwest. The Commission disapproved the design. No plans were submitted.

The drawing suggests a cheap apartment building.

The Commission recommend that the applicant be requested to submit an improved design, with perspective and plans.

At the same time, the Commission call attention to the fact that the location designated for this proposed building is within the taking line for a proposed Navy Department Building. The Public Buildings Administration Federal Works Agency, has authority from Congress to buy land for the building. The Commissioner of Public Buildings should be consulted before a permit is issued to erect the apartment.

By direction of the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very truly yours,

Director of Inspection.
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit C

November 21, 1946.

Dear Mr. Coe:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on November 20, 1946, approved the revised design which you submitted for the Sousa Junior High School, to be built at Ely Place between 36th and 37th Streets, Southeast.

Also, the Commission approved the revised design which you submitted for the Receiving Home for Children, to be built on the North side of Mt. Olivet Road west of CorCoran Street, Northeast.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley,
Acting Chairman,

Mr. Merrel A. Coe,
Municipal Architect,
District Building,
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit D.

November 21, 1946.

Dear Mr. Coe:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on November 20, 1946, approved the revised design which you submitted for the Sousa Junior High School, to be built at Fly Place between 36th and 37th Streets, Southeast.

Also, the Commission approved the revised design which you submitted for the Receiving Home for Children, to be built on the North side of Mt. Olivet Road west of [illegible].

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Acting Chairman.

cc. Mayor, D. C.,
Municipal Architect,
Director, Parks,
Zoning Officer,
Building, D.C.

November 21, 1946.

Dear Mr. Orr:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on November 20, 1946, considered the revised design which you submitted through Mr. Fox for the pedestal of the Nathan Hale statue. The Commission recognize the difficulty involved, since it is a small statue. The Commission suggest a few further changes, as indicated on the drawing attached hereto.

With regard to the inscription, the Commission have noted that the last words of Nathan Hale are inscribed around the drum of the statue. Of course it would therefore be superfluous to add it again on the base. It would seem, however, that the pedestalshould show more than the name Nathan Hale and the dates of his birth and death. The Commission suggest an inscription describing his military service, as indicated on the statue of Nathan Hale in New York City, and of which a print is enclosed.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley,
Acting Chairman.

Mr. Douglas Orr, F.A.I.A.
96 Grove Street.
New Haven,,Connecticut.

Exhibit E

Dear Mr. Orr:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on November 20, 1940, considered the revised design which you submitted through Mr. Fox for the pedestal of the Nathan Hale statue. The Commission recognize the difficulty involved, since it is a small statue. The Commission suggest a few further changes, as indicated on the drawing attached hereto.

With regard to the inscription, the Commission have noted that the last words of Nathan Hale are inscribed around the drum of the statue. Of course it would therefore be superfluous to add it again on the base. It would seem, however, that the pedestal should show more than the name Nathan Hale and the dates of his birth and death. The Commission suggest an inscription describing his military service, as indicated on the statue of Nathan Hale in New York City, and of which a print is enclosed.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

David E. Finley,

90 Grove Street.
New Haven, Connecticut.

Exhibit E

National Capital Park and Planning Comm.
Interior Building, 25
Washington, D.C.

October 30, 1946

MEMORANDUM TO MR. H.P. CAEMMERER,
Secreatry, Commission of Fine Arts,

Subject: Parcel 70/100, 16th & Shepherd Streets, N.W.

As arranged with you, the plans prepared by Berla and Abel for a 5-story apartment building with 3 basement levels, at 16th and Shepherd Streets, N.W., on Parcel 70/100, have been presented both to the Commission and to its Coordinating Committee for such advice as would be of assistance to your Commission in making its recommendation to the District Commissioners under the Shipstead Act.

The Commission at its October meeting was of the opinion that in view of the decisions made by the courts on the zoning issue, the Commission was in no position to object to the proposed building per se. However it believes that no plan should be approved which would prevent the eventual widening and opening of 17th Street in accordance with the Highway plan. It appears that only about half of 17th Street is dedicated, all of the additional required width having been planned for many years to be taken from Parcel 70/100.

The Coordinating Committee concurred in this opinion and further expressed the view that the garage entrance off 17th Street and other grading adjacent should be coordinated with the established grades of 17th Street. Nothing on the drawing submitted by the architects indicates that this has been done. The reason for this action is that 17th Street is planned to be an important entrance to Piney Branch Parkway and Rock Creek Park, especially from 16th Street, its opening having been anticipated when the roadway in Piney Branch Parkway was constructed about ten years ago. No information is available as to whether the building encroaches on 17th Street as proposed or whether the grades of the garage driveway accord with the proposed grades of 17th Stret.

The Commission asked that the Fine Arts Commission examine carefully the proposed treatment of the wall (indicated as scored concrete) enclosing the basement garage and driveway approaches, as these abut the park and extend above ground level for a considerable distance. Aside from the appearence of the wall and the possible desirability of having it of the same construction above ground as the facade of the building, there is a question to whether its

Exhibit F.

Interior Building, 25

October 30, 1946

Secretary, Commission of Fine Arts.

As arranged with you, the plans prepared by Berla and Abel for a 5-story apartment building with 3 basement levels, at 16th and Shepherd Streets, N.W., on Parcel 70\100, have been presented both to the Commission and to its Coordinating Committee for such advice as would be of assistance to your Commission in making its recommendation

The Commission at its October meeting was of the opinion that Commission was in no position to object to the proposed building per prevent the eventual widening and opening of 17th Street in accordance with the Highway Plan. It appears that only about half of 17th Street is dedicated, all of the of the additional required width having been planned for many years to be taken from Parcel 70\100.

The Committee concurred in this opinion and further expressed the view that the garage entrance off 17th Street and other grading adjacent should be coordinated with the established grades of 17th Street. Nothing on the drawing submitted by the architects indicates that this has been done. The Committee feels that this would be an important entrance to Piney opening having been abolished when the roadway in Piney Branch Parkway was constructed about ten years ago. No information is available whether the grades of the garage driveway accord with the proposed grades of 17th Street.

The Commission asked that the Fine Arts Commission examine carefully the proposed treatment of the wall (indicated as scored concrete) enclosing the basement garage and driveway approaches, as desirability of having it of the same construction above ground as the facade of the building, there is a question to whether its

construction on the property line is at all desireable from the standpoint of the park, since its effect is to shut off light and air, Paragraph 5, Section XIX of the zoning regulations gives the Building Inspector discretion as to construction of any portion of a building within required yard space below the level of the first floor of the main building. Normally such construction as here proposed is approved.

In this case, however, the adjoining property is park land not susceptible of being filled to the level of the adjoining wall so that light and air is impaired. Therefore it would seem that the Commission of Fine Arts would be warranted in objecting to the wall on the property line on the ground that it involved "reasonably avoidable impairement of the public values" belonging to the park and should be set back from the park line.

The set of plans submitted is attached.

John Nolen, Jr.
Director of Planning.

Encl.

COPY
THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
WASHINGTON

November 12, 1946.

My dear Mr. Clarke:

A few days ago General Grant sent to me a draft of Bill, of which copy is enclosed, on the proposed Sesquicentennial Celebration in 1950, for "Consideration and comments."

I replied that I thought it was a good Bill, and subsequently had a talk with him about it. I pointed out that President John Adams addressed the Congress on November 22, instead of the 21st as is generally supposed.

The Celebration could comprise a week of festivities, in which all of the States of the Union and Territories as well as foreign nations might well participate. In 1900 Centennial Day was a legal holiday in the District of Columbia, and the Governors of the States were the guests of President McKinley at a reception in the White House. The events for the week might be about as follows:

Exercises at the Capitol, with the President of the United States as principal speaker.

Reception at the White House in honor of the Governors of the States and territories.

Dedication of a Memorial Fountain to Major L'Enfant,

Historical Pageant on the City of Washington,

Reception and Exhibition at the Library of Congress (1950 marks the 150th Anniversary of the founding of the Library)

Banquet Concert Ball

Of course we should also have a large display of plans, models and pictures on the developments of the National Capitol.

Sincerely yours,

H.P. Caemmerer,
Secretary.

Mr. Gilmore D. Clarke, Chairman
National Commission of Fine Arts,
145 East 32nd Street,
New York, N.Y.

Exhibit G

Exhibit G

COPY

November 6, 1946,
U,S.G.

Draft of Joint Resolution to provide for the appropriate Commemoration of the 150 th Anniversary of the establishment of the Seat of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled, That to provide for the appropriate commemoration of the 150th Anniversary of the establishment of the seat of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia, there is hereby established a commission to be known as the United States Commission of the Commemoration of the 150 th Anniversary of the founding of the National Capital (hereinafter referred to as the Commission) and to be composed of 15 Commissioners, as follows:

The President of the United States; the presiding officer of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, ex-officio; 3 Senators appointed by the presiding officer of the Senate and 3 Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; 3 residents of the District of Columbia appointed by the President on the recommendation of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia; and 3 prominent citizens at large appointed by the President. The Commissioners shall select a chairman and a vice-chairman from among their number.

Sec.2. That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of $50,000 to be expended by the Commission in accordance with the provisions of this resolution.

Sec.3. That it shall be the duty of the Commissioners after promulgating to the American people an address relative to the reason of its creation and of its purpose, to prepare a plan or plans and a program for the signalizing of the event, to commemorate which they are brought into being; and to give due and proper consideration to any plan or plans which may be submitted to them; and to take such steps as may be necessary in the coordination and correlation of

December 6, 1940.
H.J.R.

Joint resolution to provide for the appropriate commemoration of the 150 th Anniversary of the establishment of the seat of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled, That to provide for the appropriate commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the establishment of the seat of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia, there is hereby established a commission to be known as the United States Commission of the Commemoration of the 150 th Anniversary of the Locating of the National Capital (hereinafter referred to as the Commission) and to be composed of 15 Commissioners, as follows:

The President of the United States; the presiding officer of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, ex-officio; 3 Senators appointed by the presiding officer of the Senate and 3 Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; 3 residents of the District of Columbia appointed by the President on the recommendation of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia and 3 prominent citizens at large appointed by the President. The Commissioners shall select a chairman and a vice-chairman from among their number.

Sec.2. That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of $75,000 to be expended by the Commission in accordance with the provisions of this resolution.

Sec.3. That it shall be the duty of the Commissioners after promulgating to the American people an address relative to the reason of its creation and of its purpose, to prepare a plan or plans and a program for the signalizing of the event, to commemorate which they are brought into being; and to give due and proper consideration & to any plan or plans which may be submitted to them; and to take such steps as may be necessary in the coordination and correlation of

plans prepared by State commissions, or by bodies created under appointment by the Governors of respective States and Territories and by representatives and by representatives of civic bodies; and if the participation of other nations in the commemoration be deemed advisable, to communicate with Governments of such nations.

Sec.4. That when the commission shall have approved of a plan of celebration, then it shall submit for their consideration and approval of such plan or plans, insofar as it or they may relate to the fine arts, to the Commission of Fine Arts, and insofar as it or they may relate to the plan of the National Capital and its history, to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission for their approval and in accordance with statutory requirements.

Sec.5. That the Commissiom. after selecting a chairman and a vice-chairman from among their members may employ a director and a secretary and such other assistants as may be needed to organize and perform the necessary technical and clerical work connected with the Commission's duties and may also engage the services of expert advisers without regard to Civil Service requirements, and may fix their respective compensation within the amount for such purposes.

Sec.6. The Commissioner's shall recieve no compensation for their services, but shall be paid their actual and necessary traveling, hotel and other expenses incurred in the discharge of their duties, out of the amount appropriated.

Sec.7. The Commission shall on or before the 2nd of January, 1948, make a report to the Congress, in order that enabling legislation may be enacted.

Sec.8. That the Commission hereby created shall expire within two years after the expiration of the celebration, November 22, 1950.

Sec..9. This joint resolution shall take effect immediately.

Episodes and Tableaux for Pageant on Historic Washington

1. Indian settlement in this locality
2. Georgetown --Suter's Tavern
3. L'Enfant and George Washington
4. Davy Burns and hid Cottage
5. Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, and the District Commissioners naming the City of Washington.
6. Laying the cornerstone of the Capitol, September 18,1793 by President Washington.
7. First Department Building, Real Estate investors
8. Mrs. Abegaile Adams in the White House, November 1800 East room a clothes-drying room.
9. President Adams addressing Congress, Nov.,22, 1800.
10. Pennslyvania and the Jefferson Poplar trees
11. Latrobe and the Capitol
12. Invasion by the British
13. Dolly Madison and the Octagon Treaty of Peace Feb. 1815
14. Charles Bulfinch and completing the old portion of the Capitol
15. Andrew Jackson and Peggy O'Neal (smashing his first Cabinet)
16. Andrew Jackson and the"Cheese Party" in the W.H. (4ft. in D.)
17. Andrew Jackson and locating the Treasury, (design for Patent O.old P.O)
18. Establishing the Smithsonian Institution, 1846 (debate in Congress)
19. Retrocession of Virginia portion of D.C., 1846
20. Cornerstone of the Washington Monument, July 4, 1848(in presence of Dolly Madison, Mrs. Alexander Hamilton and G.W. Parke Custis, three persons that knew Washington personally)
21. Enlarging the Capitol, Speech by Daniel Webster, Laying c.s. July 4, 1851
22. Abraham Lincoln in Washington (second Innaugural)
23. Boss Shepherd Regime and President Grant
24. McKinley and the War with Spain (Blue and Grey united)
25. Centennial Celebration, Plan of 1901
26. Theodore Roosevelt, the big stick
27. President Taft and the Lincoln Memorial
28. President Wilson and First World War
29. Presidents Coolidge and Hoover, cleaning up.Pa. Ave.
30. President Franklin D. Roosevelt and World War II.

Laying the cornerstone of the Capitol, September 18, 1793 by President Washington.

General Grant: We think legislation should be introduced at the next session and hope that you feel the same way about it. I drafted a bill, a very rough draft just something to shoot at---which is lined up somewhat on the original Centennial celebration and somewhat on the Washington Bicentennial.

Going furhter than the original Centennial Bill which merely set up a Commission to make plans and then report back and get money, et cetera--I do not think you have time for that--I thought we should in this set up a commission to make plans and go ahead and organize the celebration.

We could give them a certain amount of administrative money and enough to begin operations, perhaps to take care of the most essential things they would want to do, and then let them come back for additional items if they thought of any they could justify before Congress. Therefore, I made the appropriation for a start at $50,000, thinking that this is a very economically mined Congress and you might kill the whole thing if you ask for much more.

Mr. Bloom, with whom I talked about this because I felt sure he would be introducing legislation of his own if we didn't do something about it, was very much interested and he said he thought maybe a hundred thousand would not be to much. However, that was the last Congress. Now you have a different Congress and a different situation and he would longer be Chairman of a Committee, and I lay that before you for discussion. Whatever you think is proper.

Now, Mr. Justement is very anxious to have some competition for the plan of Washington. I mentioned that to this Commission at the last meeting and you, as I understand it indicated you were not in favor of that. I merely mention it again so that you will be apprized that it is going to come up each time and $50,000 is not going to take care of any administrative expenses and the competion too. Maybe that is one thing it might be well to leave to the Commission for justification and them express opinions to it before the Commission when the commission is set up. It is also a much smaller commission than the one that was provided for the George Washington Bicentennial in order that it might be a working commission.

The question comes up whether you want to put the President and Vice-President, or pro tem President of the Senate, and the speaker of the House on the ex-officio or not. of course, if you do, it will carry a great deal more weight. By experience I can tell you they don't work very much with a Commission.

We provided in the bill that the commission itself should choose its own Chairman so that it would not be necessary for the Chairman to go by rank and we would have perhaps a working Chairman.

Mr. Reinhard: Is the competion for the Centennial or for a new plan of Washington?

General Grant: For a new plan of Washington.

Chairman Finley: Well, we have a plan.

General Grant: It has never been published in full form and we hope to get that done with an appropriation which the Bureau of the Budget has approved. We have a great many of the Facts. We have nearly all the pieces of the jigsaw puzzle, but we haven't been able to have anybody who has the time or ability to write the other sort of presentation we want, like you have in the London Plan or any of these other really good plans.

General Grant: It has never been published in full form and we hope to get
great many of the facts. We have nearly all the pieces of the jigsaw puzzle,

That is a matter of considerable labor anda matter of expert knowledge of how to present such things to the public in a way that you dont' involve yourself too much in technical discussions, but at the same time, make it perfectly clear. That is coming along and would be ready,, we hope, within a year if we get that appropriation.

Now, as to what the Bicentennial, or what this Sesquicenttennial celebration would amount to, we would like very much to have your advice.

So far as the Government is concerned, we thought we would have an exhibit of the plan and history of Washington. That would be one of the major expenses the Government would go to and would carry entirely, but this commission and our Commission would join in and get the Library and other people who have documents of that sort the architect of the Capitol, and others to participate.

Between the date when the Act was approved moving the seat of Government to the District of Columbia, which was April 23, and the date of the session of Congress in which the President first addressed Congress, which was November 22, we would have this exhibit on during that period, and we would try to get all of the professional societies who are interested or could be interested in Washington--and as you know there are some ten of them who have committees in the national capital--to hold their annual meetings here that year during that period., the board of Trade is interested and is taking this matter up. The Building Congress is taking it up and undoubtedly they will all get other groups to come here.

In order to provide that side of it which would be nonofficial, there would have to be a citizens committee, a local citizens committee. Persumably that citizens committee would work with the offical committees. The official committee would define the program and give them thearea in which to work and they could do pretty much as they want to. That is the concept we have up to date and we would like some better ideas from you.

Chairman Finley: I think it is a very sound to ask for a moderate appropriation and then you can go back and ask for more. If you have important people on the commission, they can put their own shoulders to the wheel in getting more money.

General Grant: There is one question of tact which I might bring up. Both the Centennial in 1900 and the Washington Bicentennial was started by the Presidents submitting a message to congress asking Congress to do this. The question is whether with a Demrcratic President and a Republican Congress it would be best to adopt that approach, or to get the Congress to introduce the Bill and then get the President to indorse it or something of that sort.

Chairman Finley: We are going to have to have bipartisan coperation in even more important things than this. I think it would be to our advantage to have Mr. Bloom follow the Bill in the House.

General Grant: I would feel there might be some advantage in getting it introduced so that somebody would feel he was the father of this and would help to push it in the legislature and not have it in the danger of being just ancther administration policy that they are turning down or simply not doing anything about. On the other hand, if we did ask the President to send in the message, I think we would have to certainly try to get someone in the House and Senate persuaded to introduce it and fight for it, but he might not be ready to fight for it for political reasons as strongly as if it were an administration measure.

Chairman Finley: Who do you have in mind to introduce it?

General Grant: As it was, I had in mind Mr. Bloom in the House and Senator Barkley in the Senate, but this is a new congress. I don't know exactly who it would be now because I don't know how they are going to stack up but I imagine it would be corresponding people.

Chairman Finley: Did Mr. Bloom introduce the other Washington Bicentennial because he was Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee or because of his intreest in the subject?

General Grant: Senator Fess introduced it in the Senate. Mr. Bloom was the

high explosives behind it to drive it along, but it was done by the Republican members of the House and the Senate, as I remember it.

Mr. Sterne: Is Senator Thomas of Utah a Democrat or Republican?

General Grant: Who?

Chairman Clarke: He's a Democrat, I guess.

General Grant: I would be delighted to have some names of that kind.

Chairman Finley: Senator Lodge is coming back as a new Senator.

General Grant: Wouldnt the Fine Arts Commission join with us in asking for it; I mean to say actually go up and see the Senator and a member of the House on the subject?.

Chairman Finley: I think we all would. I would be very glad myself to do anything I could.

Mr. Sterne: I wasn't at the last meeting you mentioned. What was the Competition supposed to be for.? Can it be very briefly stated?

General Grant: The competition for the comprehensive plan for the development of the National Capital.

Chairman Finley: I think we all decided we had a very good plan and it would be very dangerous to have a lot of new minds developing new plans. Isn't that it ?

General Grant: Yes, I feel it would muddy the waters a little bit.

Mr. Reinhard: You would have to make it an open competition and it would be pretty wild scramble all the way through.

General Grant: They had a terrible time with all the suggestions that came in 1900 and finally ended up by appointing the McMillen Commission at that time to do the job. They picked out the people to do it and even that was not a complete plan. That was a Park and Public Buildings Plan only.

Chairman Finley: I think it would be much better to stick to the McMillen Plan. It is a great advantage here that we have such a plan and if it needs to be enlarged and new studies made, that would be helpful, but I would not want to see an open competition.

General Grant: It would be very expensive. When you consider the drafting of sucha plan with all the background that we have that has to be brought up to date, it would cost somewhere around $45,00 to prepare and publish. The street car and bus system cost, I understand, somewhere between fifty thousand and ---

Mr. Caemmerer: (Interposing): Fifty thousand dollars.

General Grant: That is just one subject of the plan, so you can see that $50,000 isn't going to give you competition because the competent firms are not going to do it at a definite loss. All you are going to do is get a lot of wild suggestions people throughout the country who are interested and want to reform the whole business od Washington.

Chairman Finley: Wouldn't the Commission, if they had sufficent funds, be able to employ someone to do this work?

General Grant: You mean the Bicentennial Commission?

Chairman Finley: The new commission that is authorized in your Bill.

General Grant: I don't think you would want them to do that because they will not be planners. I think I put three members from the Senate and three from the House. Then there were three appointed by the commissioner and a certain number of officials appointed by the President.

Chairman Finley: I think they should do it but I think they should be able to work very closely with Park and Planning.

General Grant: If we fail to get the money, we will have to work for it, but dont' you think the plan ought to be ready before the Sesquicentennial? Of course, as you say Mr. Finley, in approching any problem we also go back in line with the 1901 report which adopts the L'Enfant Plan, and there are quite a lot of interesting things that come up as to streets and bridges and things of that kind.

—

Now, this East Capitol Street project is in a way an effort to carry out his idea of the importance of East Capitol Street. Topograhhical conditions and street traffic conditions make it almost impossible to put the bridge at East Capitol Street, but we can develop on East Capitol Street as a grand street leading to the Capitol from that side as the Lincoln Memorial is on the other, one of them a park development and the other a street development.

November 21, 1946.

Dear Sir:

With reference to Application No. 1096 for an advertising sign at 911 Pennsylvania Avenue, Northwest, the Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on November 20, 1946, gave further consideration to the design.

The Commission deplore this style of sign, since it gives the impression of three distinct signs spread over a very large area. However, since the panel has been set in place, and holes have been bored into it, the Commission interposed no further objection to the sign, with the understanding that the area of the letters will be reduced to 25 square feet. According to measurements made, it appears the letters cover an area of 32.5 square feet. Also, no red tubing is to be used.

Respectfully yours,

H.P. Caemmerer,

Secretary.

Director of Inspection,
District Building,
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit H

Dear Sir:

With reference to Application No. 1096 for an advertising sign at 911 Pennsylvania Avenue, Northwest, the Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on November 20, 1946, gave further consideration to the design.

The Commission deplore this style of sign, since it gives the impression of three distinct signs spread over a very large area. However, since the panel has been set in place, and holes have been bored into it, the Commission interposed no further objection to the sign, with the understanding that the area of the letters will be reduced to 25 square feet. According to measurements made, it appears the letters cover an area of 32.5 square feet. Also, no red tubing is to be used.

Director of Inspection,

Exhibit H

VETERANS' HOSPITAL

Discussions, Meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, Nov.20, 1946. with representatives of the Corps of Engineers, Veterans' Admn., and architects.

Chairman Finley: I understand you have some new designs and models to present. We have here the architects, engineers, and representatives of the Veterans' Administration, and I think there is nothing we have to say except to turn the meeting over to Mr. Kiff and Mr. Justements, representing the architects of the proposed project.

Mr. Aaron N.Kiff (of York & Sawyer): At our last meeting, you will recall, we said we would do everything we could do to keep the building as inconspicuous as possible, and I believe we mentioned seven or eight stories. Now it is nine and ten stories, on the order of those sketches (indicating). I think you might explain these, Mr. Justement.

Mr. Louis Justement: As we see it, there are three positions from which you might get a relationship of our proposed Hospital to the Lincoln Memorial. Those are from the Capitol, from the foot of the Washington Monument, just to the west of the Monument or to the east of the Monument itself, and from the 17th Street east end of the Lincoln Memorial Pool. The view from the Capitol is such that it is impractical to show it by drawings and that model (the one from the Park and Planning Commission, indicating) illustrates that condition. We have made a little model on the same scale as the original model, and you can see the view from the Capitol as well as the view from the Monument and the east end of the reflecting pool.

More accurately, we have had these photographs taken (indicating) enlarged and have drawn the outline of the Lincoln Memorial on same from those points of view. Here is the photograph taken at the foot of the Washington Monument. It was taken just west of the Monument so the Monument itself does not block the view, and we have computed sizes and have established a scale as accurately as we could. Here are the computations in case anyone would like to check them, and this is the result we get.

The height of the building, as you see, is really a very secondary factor. It is the width that gives us more concern than the height but even at that point (indicating) which is, as we see it, the most disadvantageous one from which the building may be viewed in relation to the Lincoln Memorial, we are just barely within the length of the Memorial.

If you go to the next view, which is what I think is the most important view, and from which I think most people will see any relationship that might exist, you will see that the proposed Veterans' Hospital at that point is completely blanked out and even stays within the main mass of the building, so that the two end columns and the height at that point becomes even more significant. That is quite accurately drawn.

Now, another question arises as to how it would look in relationship to the general sky line, and we have computations for that.

As seen just west of the Lincoln Memorial, that is, the view taken from the Lincoln Memorial, you can see that it just barely comes to the top of the tree line at the rear of the proposed site of the Hospital. At that point, of course, you lose any relationship between the Lincoln Memorial and the Hospital, and it merely becomes a question of how the Hospital itself is going to look against the skyline of trees.

The third drawing further illustrates that in a general scene. I don't know if those white lines carry across the room, but there is the mass of the building (indicating) with relationship to the whole panorama that you see just west of the Memorial. This drawing was made in New York independently of ours and, after they lowered the building by about five feet, you can see it checks pretty closely with our drawing which was done on the basis of computations.

Exhibit I

Discussion, Meeting at the Completion of Plan Drafting, 1946.

Chairman Tracy: I understand you have some new designs and models to present. We have the architect, engineers, and representatives of the Veterans' Administration, and I think there is nothing we have to say except to turn the meeting over to Mr. Light and Mr. Pasamonte, the architects of the proposed project.

Mr. Aaron Light (of York & Sawyer): In our last meeting, you will recall we were expecting we would be able to keep the building as low as possible, and I believe ~~xxxxxxxx~~ we mentioned seven or eight stories. Now it is nine and ten stories, on the order of those sketches (indicating). I think you might explain these, Mr. Pasamonte.

Mr. Louis Pasamonte: As we see it, there are three positions from which one from the York and Sawyer drawing, indicating) illustrates that condition. We have made a little model on the same scale as the original model, and you can see the view from the Capitol as well as the view from the Monument and the east end of the Reflecting Pool.

enlarged and have drawn the outline of the Lincoln Memorial on same from beautiful Monument. It was taken just west of the Monument so the Monument itself does not block the view, and we have computed sizes and have established a scale as accurately as we could. Here are the computations in case anyone would like to check them, and this is the result we get.

factor. It is the width that gives us more concern than the height but even from which the building may be viewed in relation to the Lincoln Memorial, we are just barely within the length of the Memorial.

If you go to the next view, which is what I think is the most important view, and from which I think most people will see any relationship that might exist, you will see that the proposed Veterans' Hospital at that point is completely blocked out and even steps within the width mass of the building, so that the two end columns and the height at that point become even more significant. That is quite accurately drawn.

Now, another question arises as to how it would look in relationship to the general sky line, and we have computations for that.

As seen just west of the Lincoln Memorial, that is, the view taken from the Lincoln Memorial, you can see that it just barely comes to the top of the tree line at the rest of the proposed site of the Hospital. At that point, of course, you lose any relationship between the Lincoln Memorial and the Hospital, but it merely becomes a question of how the Hospital itself is going to look against the skyline of trees.

The third drawing further illustrates that in a general scene. I don't

building (indicating) with relationship to the whole panorama that you see just west of the Memorial. This drawing was made in New York independently of any

Presently closely with our drawing which was done on the basis of computations,

From there out it becomes a question of what the building itself would look like and how it would be seen in perspective. We thought one of the most important points of view would be as seen from the place where Lee Boulevard curves around and starts going into Virginia, and that is the point of view chosen for this picture.

I think that explains the material which we have here for presentation and perhaps you had better carry on from there.

Mr. Kiff: There isn't much to carry on except the sketch picture. We have done everything we think we can in the general mass of the building to keep it as informal as possible. It is basically a symmetrical plan because it works out best for the hospital, but we have tried in the lower part and in the upper part to get as much informality as we could get in that sort of a building.

The building, incidentally, is four hundred and twenty (420) feet long as it is drawn and that, we feel, is a maximum. We had side lines to establish what the District office has established, what the tree-line elevation is, and all these things are based on those computations and, as Mr. Justement pointed out, in working independently, he here and we in New York, it checks pretty well.

(An informal discussion and vieweing of the model was had off the record)

Mr. Kiff: In most hospitals at nine or nine-thirty o'clock at night the lights are supposed to be turned out in bedrooms and are only on if and when needed when serving a patient, so we think we have shown a maximum of what might be shown at one time. (A photostat print was presented of the night lighting condition).

It looks like a big paper mass. You have known of that effect on a building of this type. I do not mean by that that this is the same as an office building.

Mr. Reinhard. What material have you in mind in relation to the finish of the exterior.

Mr. Justement: It might be cheaper to use stone, that is our own local stone, than it would be to use brick.

Mr. Reinhard: What color?

Mr. Justement. If stone or brick, a light salmon. There is one other important aspect of the building that I forgot to mention and that is the fact that while we have been talking about seeing it directly, you may wonder what happens if you look at it from Constitution Avenue. Either you are going to see it directly, or primarily you will see it from Constitution Avenue and, at the last meeting I mentioned the supposition that you would not see it from Constitution Avenue because of the trees. I checked that but there is no foliage on trees now, and yet the massive branches are such that I could not see anything. You won't see that building from Constitution Avenue, even in the wintertime. That is a very important view if you could see it but you cannot because of the trees.

Mr. Reinhard: Let us see the floor plans of the building. What do you have on the front, the elevation we are discussing?

Mr. Kiff: Above the second floor we have individual rooms. Here and there (indicating) need be no windows. There (indicating) we have four bedrooms. We tried to get as much glass in as possible. The larger part of that room would be glass. These (indicating) depending on what would be the equivalent of one window for a room, but we will try to use a bigger window of glass. We have a larger detail of that. We have shown windows

here (indicating). We haven't designed this fenestration at the moment.

Mr. Reinhard: You will need a lot of glass. We are sure of that.

Mr. Kiff: We would like to get a lot of glass in. If in developing this you people decide you want more effective masonry on the corners, more in the traditional style, that would be arranged. That is the major part of the building.

General U. S. Grant III: I feel from the Capitol that is not going to make very much difference. I think the most critical point is right there at the Lincoln Memorial. From Constitution Avenue you are not going to see it at all.

Mr. Justement: I am sure of that, I am sure of that because more people will see it from there than any other point.

Mr. Murphy: I don't feel there is enough projecting there (indicating) to make very much difference.

Mr. Kiff: You will probably get light here (indicating) because it puts those two rooms on the north and it might be east and west.

Mr. Reinhard: I think we all have the same sort of color in mind and a strong solid surface at the ends might help where it does project a little over the Lincoln Memorial.

Mr. Kiff: We feel this could be worked out and will keep it in mind as we study the elevation.

Mr. John Nolen, Jr: May I ask a question? Mr. Justement probably can answer it. From the level of the top of the Water-gate, will the building in perspective show above the tree line?

Mr. Justement: It is bound to. We couldn't possibly keep it low enough to prevent that.

Mr. Nolen: But at the other elevations at the Washington Monument and from the Lincoln Memorial it is below?

Mr. Justement: It is below.

Mr. Kiff: This (indicating) is taken from the west side of the Memorial, so the closer you get to it, the more it is bound to come up. It is taken from the driveway not the rotunda; that is not the lower driveway, however.

Mr. Nolen: I didn't mean the lower drive because I do not think that is important.

Mr. Kiff: On the other hand, in that view you also must remember there is plenty of trees which will also rise higher on the building, not high enough to break the top of the building, but will tend to rise on the face of the building. We have not shown front planting on our drawings. We hope to have lots of it.

Mr. Nolen: You have shown it the way it is going to be the first twenty years.

Mr. Kiff: If the District engineer will just let us put a few trees in there---

Mr. Murphy (interposing): What I would like to know is why the architect did not show the trees.

Mr. Kiff: Just for the reason we did not know exactly what we were doing. If there would have been competition, we would have had lots of trees in there.

General Grant: I do not believe the view from the Water Gate is so important. When you get to the end of the river you have so many irregularities.

Mr. Justement: Two-thirds of all the nursing rooms face toward the

river. They face east.

Mr. Kiff: There are nine stories in the main mass and the tenth story extends over half of the building.

Mr. Murphy: How high is the building?

Mr. Kiff: The ten stories are about one hundred and sixteen feet.

Mr. H.P.Caemmerer: Nine stories are one hundred and sixteen feet.

Mr. Kiff: No, ten stories are one hundred and sixteen feet. I will show you on the picture. The ten stories are one hundred and sixteen feet. It is four hundred and twenty feet long exactly at this state of the presentation.

Mr. Caemmerer: And there is a wing on the back?

Mr. Kiff: There is a wing on the back.

Chairman Finley: Col. White, is there anything you would like to say?

Col. White: Nothing further on this explanation. We would like to leave here with your blessing to proceed along these lines because we are very anxious to get into the detail work.

Mr. Kiff: I would like very much, if it is in order, to ask the Commission what their conception is as to the style of the building or the feeling of the architectural treatment this ought to be done in. We know they don't want the monumental but there are considerable differences in types of modern.

Mr. Caemmerer: You are in Colonial Virginia.

Mr. Kiff: Well, I think any traditional style in a building of this size or any period style would be out, but you can do it with strip windows the whole length of the building with the look of masonry about it. I would think you would probably want some feeling of masonry structure in the building rather than----

Mr. Reinhard: We do not want any blitz of horizontal windows. Do a good modern job.

Mr. Sterne: There is a functional architect I met some time ago.

Mr. Reinhard: What is his name?

Mr. Sterne: I met him in San Francisco. He showed me pictures, and I thought it was one of the most interesting, in fact, the finest hospital I had ever seen. I can't think of his name. Do you know his name?

Mr. William E. Jeffrey (Office of Chief of Engineers): Eric Mendelssohn.

Mr. Reinhard: I saw it published in one of the magazines.

Mr. Justement: Was it Alto?

Mr. Sterne: That is his name. I have spent quite a lot of time in hospitals, and I would like to see some system in the rooms. It might sound silly but I find one gets so bored, especially during the so-called convalescence. If one could have some kind of reflecting mirrors alongside the ceiling to reflect things that are happening outside, I think it would be very, very entertaining and stimulating to the patients.

Mr. Kiff: They have a system. Have you seen it? Of course, it can only be done where they show moving pictures on the ceiling.

Mr. Sterne: I think most people go to hospitals because they have seen too many moving pictures. I think we should have some reflections of life going on down below.

Mr. Murphy: Are they psychopathic patients?

Mr. Kiff: The top floor is psychopathic. It is primarily a general hospital. It would have the same proportion of psychopathic beds that any good general hospital might have.

Chairman Finley: How many beds are there?

Mr. Kiff: Now there are one hundred and twenty beds on a level.

Mr. Reinhard: When you get mixed up with the kind of problem we here have today in our general hospital designs and the groups we have to work with, it is pretty hard to get down to the sort of job Alto did. He did a very outstanding piece of work.

Mr. Sterne: It has not been so very long ago; I would say about ten years ago.

Mr. Reinhard: I am personally not worried if the architects just keep away from the modern blitz and do a good modern job in this location and for this project.

Mr. Kiff: I take that as a compliment.

Mr. Murphy: Does the plan work out in height?

Mr. Kiff: If we have no objections, this is the way we would do it. The places we have compromised on this are such that we almost defy anyone to find them. There has been no compromise as to the arrangement of beds and distribution as to height or layout.

That gets back to really how many beds can you put on a floor. You could develop what would look like a perfectly good floor but you get so you have a terrific conjestion. As it is, there are one hundred and twenty patients on a level, which is a lot of patients to handle.

Chairman Finley: Mr. Lawrie, do you have anything to say?

Mr. Lawrie: No comments.

Mr. Reinhard: I think the Veterans Bureau and the architects are to be congratulated for their fine presentation and cooperation to date with the Fine Arts Commission.

Mr. Kiff: Thank you very much. We would like to carry on with it from now on in with materials and all. We hope you will give us as much help as you can on that.

Mr. Reinhard: We would like a complete set of all the photos, data, sketches, etc., you presented to the Commission at this meeting for our Record.

Mr. Justement: We will have one made (A photostat) in Washington and deliver it to Mr. Caemmerer.

Col. White: Do you assume then that we can proceed on this general framework?

Chairman Finley: Yes, I think you may proceed.

Col. White: Thank you very much.

(Representatives from the Veterans Bureau, Mr. Justement, Mr. Kiff of York & Sawyer, representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and several assistants thereupon left the meeting)

Mr. Heinhard: When you get mixed up with the kind of problem we have today in our General Hospital designs and the groups we have to work with, it is pretty hard to get down to the sort of job Alto did. He did a very outstanding piece of work.

Mr. Greene: It has not been so very long ago; I would say about ten years ago.

Mr. Holabird: I am personally not worried if the architects just keep away from the modern plita and do a good modern job in this location and for this project.

Mr. Kiff: I take that as a compliment.

Mr. Murphy: Does the plan work out in height?

Mr. Kiff: If we have no objections, this is the way we would do it. The places we have compromised on this are such that we almost defy anyone to find them. There has been no compromise as to the arrangement of beds and distribution as to height or layout.

That gets back to really how many beds can you put on a floor. You could develop what would look like a perfectly good floor but you get so you have a terrific congestion. As it is, there are one hundred and twenty patients on a level, which is a lot of patients to handle.

Chairman Finley: Mr. Lawrie, do you have anything to say?

Mr. Lawrie: No comments.

Mr. Heinhard: I think the Veterans Bureau and the architects are to be congratulated for their fine presentation and cooperation to date with the Time Arts Commission.

Mr. Kiff: Thank you very much. We would like to carry on with it from now on in with materials and all. We hope you will give us as much help as you can on that.

Mr. Heinhard: We would like a complete set of all the photos, data, sketches, etc., you presented to the Commission at this meeting for our Record.

Mr. Justement: We will have one made (A photostat) in Washington and deliver it to Mr. Casmeter.

Col. White: Do you assume then that we can proceed on this general framework?

Chairman Finley: Yes, I think you may proceed.

Col. White: Thank you very much.

(Representatives from the Veterans Bureau, Mr. Justement, Mr. Kiff of York & Sawyer, representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and several associates thereupon left the meeting)

Copy

1 Federal Street, Boston

November 19th,1946

Dr. H.P. Caemmerer
The Commission of Fine Arts
Interior Department Building
Washington, D.C.

Dear Dr. Caemmerer:

The Commission appreciates very much the time and effort that you took on Friday to personally conduct us through the Washington memorials.

I have just returned and I have before me now your book together with the photos of the Kanas City war memorial which you can be sure the Commission will study very carefully, as it seems to give us about every type of memorial that we could consider. As soon as we get some sort of a report in shape for the Legislature, I will let you know what we have determined upon.

Sincerely yours,

Michael J. Galvin

Exhibit J.

Copy

1 Federal Street, Boston

November 19th, 1946

Dr. H.P. Caemmerer
The Commission of Fine Arts
Interior Department Building
Washington, D.C.

Dear Dr. Caemmerer:

The Commission appreciates very much the time and effort that you took on Friday to personally conduct us through the Washington memorials.

I have just returned and I have before me now your book together with the photos of the Kansas City war memorial which you can be sure the Commission will study very carefully, as it seems to give us about every type of memorial that we could consider. As soon as we get some sort of a report in shape for the Legislature, I will let you know what we have determined upon.

Sincerely Yours,

Michael J. Galvin

Exhibit 1.